	kci2WeiS kjc	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.
4	V.	20 Cr. 510 (WHP)
5	MICAEL WEIGAND,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	Videoconference
8		Sentencing
9		December 18, 2020
10		2:00 p.m.
11	Before:	
12	HON. WILLIAM H. PAULEY III,	
13		District Judge
14		21301130 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
15		
16	APPEARAN	CES
17	AUDREY STRAUSS	
18	Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
19	BY: MICHAEL D. NEFF Assistant United States Attorney	
20	ribbibeane onreca beates needs.	
21	AVROM J. ROBIN	
22	Attorney for Defendant	
23		
24		
25		

25

THE COURT: In the case of United States of America v. 1 2 Michael R. Weigand, would counsel for the government give his 3 appearance. 4 MR. NEFF: Good afternoon, your Honor. Michael Neff 5 for the government, and also on the line are IRS Supervisory Special Agent Gary Alford and F.B.I. Special Agent Sam 6 7 Shahrani. THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon to you, 8 9 Mr. Neff. 10 Would counsel for the defendant give his appearance. 11 MR. ROBIN: Good afternoon, your Honor. This is Avrom 12 Robin for the defendant, Michael Weigand, who is also present 13 with us via Skype. He is wearing a red shirt. You should be 14 able to see him. 15 THE COURT: I am. Thank you. Good afternoon to you, Mr. Robin. 16 17 Mr. Weigand, I note your presence via Skype. Are you 18 able to see and hear me, sir? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am. 20 THE COURT: Very well. And just for the record, where 21 are you currently located? 22 THE DEFENDANT: At home. 23 THE COURT: All right. And where is that, sir? 24 THE DEFENDANT: That would be Kirtland, Ohio.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, we are here today for sentencing. As we all know, we are in the middle of the COVID pandemic, and I'm conducting this proceeding remotely pursuant to the authority provided by the CARES Act, Section 15002, and the standing orders that were issued by the chief judge of this district. I'm proceeding by videoconference, namely, via Skype, as are counsel and the defendant.

Mr. Robin, have you discussed with your client proceeding today via videoconference as opposed to appearing in court in person?

MR. ROBIN: Yes, Judge, I have.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Weigand, do you waive your right, sir, to be physically present in court and to proceed today by videoconference?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: And if at any point during this proceeding, you are unable to hear me or see me or the other participants in this proceeding, will you let me know right away so that we can address that?

THE DEFENDANT: I will.

THE COURT: And also if at any point you would like to speak privately with your attorney, will you let me know that right away, and I will -- so that we can coordinate that with you and your attorney?

1 THE DEFENDANT: I will.

THE COURT: Very well.

Based upon this colloquy, I find a knowing and voluntary waiver of the right to be physically present for this proceeding. I also find that today's proceeding cannot be further delayed without serious harm to the interests of justice. It is important that this matter proceed through sentencing to bring finality to the matter both for the Court and the parties. Resolution of this matter remotely advances these issues and promotes justice without undue delay to wait until some unknown time in the future when we can proceed in person. And so I find that this proceeding cannot be further delayed without serious harm to the interests of justice.

As I have said, this matter is on for sentencing. Are the parties ready to proceed?

MR. NEFF: Yes, your Honor.

MR. ROBIN: Yes, for the defense, we are ready.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Robin, have you reviewed with your client the presentence investigation report?

MR. ROBIN: Yes, Judge, I have.

THE COURT: All right. I note that the parties had previously submitted various amendments to the report, and I ask you, Mr. Robin, whether the defendant has any further modifications or amendments to the presentence report?

MR. ROBIN: I do just have one small one, Judge, but it's more by way of a clarification. It goes to paragraph 89, about the defendant's negative monthly cash flow.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. ROBIN: Just going back one page, to paragraph 20, the reason for the negative monthly cash flow on this specific month — it is not a habit of Mr. Weigand and his wife to overspend — under "clothing" there is an entry for \$704, and that includes, by mistake, an amount that was spent for a new set of tires for Mrs. Weigand's car, totaling about \$600 or over \$600, so that explains the negative cash flow in this given month.

THE COURT: All right. I appreciate that clarification. Is there any reason to make any change in the report?

MR. ROBIN: No, I don't think so, Judge. I don't think it is necessary.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Neff, are there any matters in the presentence report that the government believes warrant modification or correction?

MR. NEFF: Thank you, Judge. There is, I believe — there are two small joint requests from the parties, and Mr. Robin will correct me if I am mistaken. We submitted an e-mail to your Honor's deputy last night just so that your

Honor would have the precise wording that we are proposing and the alphanumeric string associated with one of the identifying numbers. Would it be useful for me to read those two things into the record, those two requests?

THE COURT: Yes, I think it would, Mr. Neff.

MR. NEFF: Certainly.

As to paragraph 41 of the PSR, there is a request to strike the phrase "and there is no evidence that links Weigand to the murder-for-hire scheme." And then in paragraph 42, the request is to add a new sentence at the end of that paragraph, following the block quote, which would state, "There is no evidence or claim that links Weigand to the murder-for-hire scheme of Ulbricht and Clark." That is the first request.

The second request, which also is a joint request, is that Mr. Weigand's F.B.I. and Marshal numbers be added to page 2 of the PSR, which I believe presently states "unknown," but recently those numbers have become known. The Marshal number is 20570-509, and the F.B.I. number is R748EL9TN.

THE COURT: All right. I will endeavor to have those physical corrections made to the presentence report.

MR. NEFF: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

I have received the parties' various submissions.

Mr. Robin, do you wish to be heard?

MR. ROBIN: I do, Judge. Thank you.

I would like to speak on three topics. One is Mr. Weigand's character; the second is the crime we are here for today; and the third is the appropriate sentence. I will be brief on all of the subjects because I have covered them in depth in my submission.

To Mr. Weigand's character, Judge, this conduct is out of character, in what has -- in his life otherwise, which has been conventional, hard-working, tax-paying. The letters and the PSR speak to his being a good family man, a good husband, a good father, a good son-in-law.

He spent the whole of his 59 years in the State of Ohio. There is not a hint of any bad conduct anywhere in his background other than this offense, and the strong letters from his family support that. The family is clearly — and this comes out in the letters — in shock and disbelief that he would do anything criminal, because it is out of character for him, as they know him and as they have lived with him.

Even Mr. Weigand's present employer, with whom he has discussed this case and given a copy of his plea agreement, said he is willing to keep Mr. Weigand on as a software engineer, providing he doesn't have to go to jail and can't work, and that, again, is because of his character and the good quality of his work that he does.

And even Roger Thomas Clark, who we will get to in a minute, says at some point that Mr. Weigand wants to be a

family man and doesn't want to go all in to this crime.

And with that, I will turn to my second piece, the crime, the Silk Road.

The crime of sentence is lying to federal agents, but the background of the subject lies in Mr. Weigand's relationship to Roger Thomas Clark, whose case I know is pending before your Honor.

Mr. Weigand met Roger Thomas Clark online in 2005, as I explained in my sentencing memorandum, and Mr. Weigand bonded with Clark back then when Mr. Weigand was looking for a source for marijuana for medical use to treat his father-in-law's lymphoma, and their online relationship, Clark and Weigand, continued. And this is the source of Mr. Weigand's problems here.

His problem, as I see it, stems from the fact, Judge, that he never learned to say no to Clark's requests. And at some point, certainly by 2011, when Clark had become Ross Ulbricht's right-hand man and senior advisor in the Silk Road, paragraph 10 in the PSR, Mr. Weigand should have been asking himself a lot more questions about what Clark was doing with Mr. Weigand's work product and insights and technological assistance and guidance. Mr. Weigand turned a blind eye here. And we know that willful blindness is not a defense, and Mr. Weigand's guilty plea acknowledges that reality, because his lies to law enforcement were in an attempt to cover up what

he now knows was illegal conduct, the Silk Road.

Still, he is not responsible — he, my client — for the whole of the Silk Road. He is a guy who did some tech work for the Silk Road. He didn't do all of the tech work. A lot of other people were involved. He did not, for example, as is referred to in paragraph 14 of the PSR, set up the so-called tumbler that disguised the processing of Bitcoin transactions.

The government does detail in their letter what he did do. I'm not going to quibble with that now. But I think he had a lesser role, judging from the amounts of money we are talking about here and from the fact that other people who have been sentenced by other judges were significantly more involved. Silk Road would have existed without Mr. Weigand. He is good at what he does, my client, but his skills are not unique to him.

I would like to turn now for a minute to the money amounts that have come up in the record here so far. Paragraph 17 -- and when I speak of paragraphs, I of course refer to the PSR -- Ulbricht's assets, \$104 million; paragraph 18, Ulbricht's seized Bitcoins, \$18 million; paragraph 21 and paragraph 47, Mr. Weigand's loss amount here, which is part of his guideline calculation, a total of \$75,000 -- \$10,000 in YubiKeys, a security device that he sold a number of on eBay, and \$65,000 in Bitcoins.

So I think when you put that up against even the

lesser amount of \$18 million Ulbricht-seized Bitcoins, kind of gives you some idea of Mr. Weigand's relative position in this case.

Yes, paragraph 25, he supplied advice, technological analysis, ideas and --

(Indiscernible crosstalk)

THE COURT: Excuse me. Whoever is interrupting this proceeding, please put your phone on mute.

Please proceed, Mr. Robin.

MR. ROBIN: Thank you, Judge.

And paragraph 26, again, Clark says he is not in the top circle, Mr. Weigand, because he doesn't want to be. He wants to raise a family without the high level of stress. He is a resource, and a great one, but doesn't want to go all in.

I'm going to move on to sentence here, Judge, the third and final part of my presentation. I want to talk for a minute about the guidelines and the loss amount. I know we have lots of conversations about how loss amount and, in other cases, drug amounts drive the guidelines. I think in a way this case is a good example, because if Mr. Weigand were at just one level less, in other words, if he were at 15 to \$40,000 loss amount, instead of the \$40 to \$95,000 he is in, we would be adding four levels, not six levels, and his guideline — his total adjusted guideline range would be zero to six months instead of six to twelve months, and I would be

asking for a sentence at the bottom of range, not a variance, like I am now. And that is not a big difference, I submit, 25, \$30,000.

Moving on, as your Honor is obviously acutely aware, this is not business as usual today. COVID is a once-in-100-years event. Mr. Weigand is not young. He is not of a normal body mass. He is at higher risk if he is imprisoned.

The felony conviction, Judge, here, is the real punishment. If the present employer does let him go, and we hope he doesn't, but if that happens, Mr. Weigand is going to have a really tough time getting rehired at the age of 59 with a felony conviction in his field.

So I submit there is no need to incarcerate him. The reality of the felony conviction, in addition to his age, obesity, the COVID risk, his lack of prior offenses, all support a nonjail sentence in this case.

Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Robin.

Mr. Neff, does the government wish to be heard?

MR. NEFF: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

I would like to briefly speak to the 3553(a) factors and also briefly respond to some of the defense's points from today.

As to the nature of the offense, the defendant made a calculated, deliberate decision to lie about his and Clark's

involvement in the Silk Road. The defendant tried to inject false information into the justice system. He tried to obstruct Clark's case. He put his loyalty to Clark first. He put loyalty before truth. He wanted his very close confidante to get off scot-free. These were the defendant's decisions, and it was déjà vu all over again.

In 2013, the defendant tried to obstruct the investigation of Clark. In 2019, the defendant tried to obstruct the prosecution of Clark. 2013 involved physical evidence in London. 2019 involved false statements in New York.

The defendant's false statements were the culmination of a multiyear, multicontinent, multifaceted campaign of obstruction. It's worth noting that if other people did what the defendant has done, it would have significant consequences for the justice system, for defendants, for victims, for the public's trust in the system, to name just a few of the consequences. So from the perspective of general deterrence, we ask the Court to send a very clear message that deliberately injecting false information into the justice system comes with serious consequences.

As to specific deterrence, there were so many major moments across this eight-year campaign when the defendant could have stopped and should have stopped. Seven such moments promptly come to mind: Ulbricht's arrest, Ulbricht's bail

arguments, Ulbricht's conviction, Ulbricht's life sentence, Clark's being publicly identified, Clark's arrest, Clark's extradition. That's seven major moments from 2013 to mid 2018. Any one of these moments should have conveyed to the defendant enough is enough. Stop committing crimes. And in particular one certainly would have thought that a life sentence for someone you directly helped, Ross Ulbricht, would have served as a very clear wake-up call, that this is extremely serious business, and I better stop playing with fire. But after all of these moments, the defendant obstructed again through his false statements in 2019, again trying to help Clark and himself.

I want to briefly address a few of the points raised by the defense today.

"turned a blind eye." He didn't turn a blind eye. He knew what he was doing. We quote the messages where the defendant gave advice, technological advice, directly to Ross Ulbricht.

Ross Ulbricht's moniker, his online nickname at that time, was Silk Road. This was not willful blindness. This is willful participation. This was willful hacking followed by willful aiding and abetting narcotics distribution, followed by willful money laundering, followed by willful obstruction, followed by willful lies. It was not just about Clark, as mentioned.

There was advice to Ulbricht, too. This was very willful and

very harmful and a clear message -- we submit a clear message should be sent that this is not acceptable and will not be tolerated.

For these reasons, as well as those in our submission, we respectfully request a sentence at the top of the guidelines range.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Neff.

Mr. Robin, does your client wish to address the Court before sentence is imposed?

MR. ROBIN: My client and I have discussed that,

Judge, and his preference would be to allow me to speak for him

and not to make a statement today.

THE COURT: Very well.

So the defendant, Michael Weigand, comes before this Court, having pled guilty to making false statements to government officials, a serious crime against the United States, to be sure. In this particular case, those false statements went beyond their mere falsity to essentially try to sidetrack the government's efforts to bring to an end a vast global criminal enterprise known as the Silk Road.

This Court has reviewed the presentence investigation report. I adopt the findings of fact in the report as amended here on the record as my own, and I will cause the report to be docketed and filed under seal as part of the record in this case.

Turning to the guidelines calculation, the base offense level for making false statements is six and the specific offense characteristic here, based upon his false statements relating to money laundering activities, as Mr. Robin has noted, propels that base offense level of six by six more units.

Now, the defendant pled guilty and accepted responsibility for his criminal act and, accordingly, I grant him a two-level reduction, and so his total offense level is 10.

As the parties have noted, this is his first criminal conviction and so, with a criminal history category of I and a total offense level of 10, his guideline range is from six to twelve months of imprisonment.

Now, of course, as in all cases before the Court for sentencing, the question is what to do with this individual who is before me. He is in some ways a very puzzling figure to me. He grew up in a firmly middle class background, with a nuclear family and siblings, you know, all of whom have gone on in their lives, many of them professionals. He, too, went to college, got an engineering degree, and became essentially a software engineer, working for a portion of his life as an independent contractor and then working for various firms.

He is obviously very bright. He has a very special technical expertise that he brought to bear in essentially

helping to enable a criminal enterprise that he certainly should have seen the red flags that were all around him with respect to Mr. Clark and Mr. Ulbricht.

And he continued on this path for a number of years, even after the government had uncovered Silk Road and arrested its founder and was prosecuting the founder's right-hand man, Mr. Clark, through extradition proceedings. But he went on with the disinformation.

And so it's a serious offense that requires both general deterrence, for the obvious reasons, and specific deterrence. And while, you know, he didn't found Silk Road, he certainly helped perpetuate its existence by providing technical expertise to Clark and Ulbricht, and even taking acts like traveling, traveling to London on very short notice to remove evidence from Clark's apartment, and going in a disguised way, going through Toronto, as if he were not traveling overseas. It was very much cloak and dagger. And were it not for the incredible work of the IRS agent who first started on this case and his keen analytical insights, who knows how long this may have continued and how much harm it could have caused to people not only in the United States but around the world? So I do think that there is, as I said, a compelling need for deterrence.

I am also somewhat skeptical of the defendant's argument that there is little possibility of recidivism here,

given his age. These were -- this was a crime that essentially in part is committed almost anonymously and, therefore, it can be particularly pernicious.

So I do think that some term of imprisonment is entirely appropriate here. I think that the defendant received from the government a very tempered plea offer, which the defendant accepted, and that also helps to bring finality in the case. I am cognizant of the defendant's medical issues, and I do not intend for him to serve a term of imprisonment while the -- while the pandemic is ongoing and there are outbreaks in correctional facilities around the country. But this is a crime that contributed to a much larger crime for which he was not charged, a crime that, as the parties have already observed, led to a term of life imprisonment for the leader of Silk Road, which was affirm by the Second Circuit, and because of the anonymity that these sort of dark web enterprises can enjoy, it makes it incredibly difficult for law enforcement to be able to root them out.

And so it is against this backdrop, looking at who Mr. Weigand is, you know, a very intelligent, analytical, thoughtful person, raised — not only did he grow up in a good family in Ohio, he and his wife have raised a good family in Ohio, and he has, you know, two sons that he can be very proud of. And so it gives me no pleasure to have to impose a term of imprisonment on him, but I will not shirk from that duty

because I think that his conduct over a period of eight years, culminating in his false statements and his dissemination of disinformation, warrant a term of imprisonment.

And so, Mr. Weigand, it is against that backdrop, sir, and I have tried to explain to you why I believe a term of imprisonment is appropriate here, it is my judgment, sir, that you be sentenced to a term of eight months of imprisonment, to be followed by three years of supervised release, subject to all of the standard conditions of supervised release, and the following special conditions:

First, that you will submit your person, property, residence, vehicle, papers, computers, other electronic communication, and data storage devices, cloud storage, or media and effects to a search by any United States probation officer and, if needed, with the assistance of any law enforcement. The search is to be conducted when there is a reasonable suspicion concerning violation of the conditions of supervision or unlawful conduct by the person being supervised. Your failure to submit to such a search may be grounds for revocation of release. You are to warn any other occupant of the premises where you reside that those premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition and any such search will be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

Further, I'm going to require you to provide your

probation officer to access to any requested financial information, and I am going to require you, as well, to not incur any new credit card charges or open additional lines of credit unless you are in compliance with a brief installment payment schedule that I am going to impose upon you. I am going to impose a — I cannot agree with probation to impose the fine that they propose, but it is my judgment that you should bear some financial consequence for this, because it was really driven by an interest in financial gain. And so it is my judgment that you should pay a fine of \$4,000. It can be paid in installments over time, and you are going to be continuing, I presume, to work for a while, awaiting surrender, and so I think that it is likely that this fine should be paid between now and the time that you do surrender to the United States Marshal Service.

I am also going to impose the mandatory \$100 special assessment which will be due and payable immediately.

Now, this constitutes the sentence of this Court,
Mr. Weigand. I advise you that to the extent you have not
previously waived your right to appeal, you have the right to
appeal. I advise you further that if you cannot afford
counsel, counsel will be provided to you free of cost.
Mr. Robin has done an outstanding job for you in connection
with this matter, in his negotiation of the plea and in his
submissions on your behalf with respect to sentencing, and I am

confident that he will advise you further with respect to your appellate rights.

Now, I can't see into the future, but for now, I am going to propose that your surrender date be in April of 2021.

And if, Mr. Robin, the situation within the Bureau of Prisons or generally with respect to the pandemic has not been resolved by that time, you may feel free to make a further application to me to extend his surrender date.

Now, if you will bear with me for one moment, I will set his surrender date to a facility to be designated by the Bureau of Prisons on April 29, 2021.

Are there any further applications from the government?

MR. NEFF: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Robin, are there any further applications from the defendant?

MR. ROBIN: Yes, Judge. I would ask you to consider a recommendation that he be incarcerated as close to home as possible to facilitate family visits.

THE COURT: I will include that recommendation on the face of the judgment, Mr. Robin.

MR. ROBIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Now, what district, what judicial district does he live in in Ohio?

MR. ROBIN: Northern judicial district.

Case 1:20-cr-0
kci2WeiS kjc

THE
recommendation
All
of you a safe
Mr.
this and that
violation of
luck.

THE COURT: All right. I will include that in the recommendation.

All right. This proceeding is concluded. I wish all of you a safe holiday season.

Mr. Weigand, I trust that you will learn from all of this and that I will not see you again in connection with any violation of supervised release, so I wish you the best of luck.

Have a good afternoon.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Judge.

MR. ROBIN: Thank you.

12 000